



775, 697

Application No. 10/755,697  
Applicant Xiaoda (Richard) Xiao  
135 Belchertown Rd.  
Amherst, MA 01002  
Voice: 413-253-7456  
Examiner Pranav V. Khatri  
Art Unit 2872

Complaint against the examiner for his inadequacy and irresponsiveness

Director for Patent

P.O.Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

03/21/2006

Sir,

I am concerned about Mr. Khatri, who is the examiner of my patent application. It is obvious that he does not understand the features of Appellant's invention at all, nor does he understand that of the prior art references for the rejection of the claims, or he could not have taken those very simple elements such as a shatterproof glass for a antiglare coating ( I'll provide evidence if necessary), a mounting plate adhered to a windshield for a soft mounting pad that fits different shapes of the car window pillars, clip 10 (Bury Fig 1) for a U-shaped top of the mounting base of Appellant's invention (Fig.2), a gusset on the car door (Manzoni Fig.1) for an inside window pillar of Appellant's invention, leave alone the complicated features such as the pivoting adjustment (Sharp) which the examiner regards as something identical with the symmetrical adjustment of Appellant's invention.

Accordingly, his judgment on my invention was groundless and nonsense.

In the final office action, a surprisingly word for word duplication of the specification of Appellant's application, the examiner declares that the Appellant's claims are rejected "in view of Deline, in further view of Stern, and in further view of Sharp and in further view of Bury and in further view of Manzoni" and so on and so forth.

Appellant hope your honor will be able to investigate the case and correct at least the obvious mistakes the examiner made and make sure Appellant's rights are not violated again. I look forward to your response. I will take legal action against the examiner if my questions regarding the above stated issues are unanswered within two months.

Sincerely,



Xiaoda (Richard) Xiao